

Contents - Lincoln

Greely - American Conflict

McPherson - Political History  
(During Rebellion) of U.S.

Fletcher - History of Am. War

Conway - Testimonies  
concerning Slavery

Lothian - Confederate Secession

(1865 - 1868)  
Songs of the Camp





From the Westminster Review.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY REVOLUTION IN AMERICA.

1. *The American Conflict: A History of the Great Civil War in the United States of America, &c., &c.* By HORACE GREELEY. Illustrated by Portraits on Steel, Views, Maps, Diagrams of Battle Fields, &c. Vol. I. London: Bacon & Co., 1865.
2. *The Political History of the United States of America during the Great Rebellion, &c., &c.* By EDWARD MCPHERSON, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the U. S. Washington: Phipp & Solomons, (Trübner & Co.)
3. *History of the American War.* By Lieutenant-Colonel FLETCHER, Scots Fusilier Guards. Vol. I. (Bentley & Co.)
4. *Testimonies Concerning Slavery.* By M. D. CONWAY, a Native of Virginia. Second edition. Chapman & Hall, 1865.
5. *The Confederate Secession.* By the MARQUESS of LOTHIAN. William Blackwood & Sons. 1864.

IF anything had been needed to confirm the instinct of those, who from the first have held the American war to be a final struggle between slavery and freedom, it would have been supplied in the character of the influence which that war has had upon the politics of other nations. The invisible rays of the war-spectrum have been potent enough on this side of the Atlantic to affect profoundly the conditions of all popular struggles for political rights. At an early date, the American war became an English question; a question whose character is indicated in the less distinct class-division which occurred upon it, and whose depth may be gauged by the profound agitations by which its discussion has been attended. This discussion has been traceable here in disturbed meetings, in collisions, and some law-suits. Candidates have been broken upon or beneath it. It is not supposable, that a war turning upon any local or sectional question, involving no universal principle, or a tariff-war, should have stirred so deeply a foreign people, and a people somewhat noted for common-sense. It was felt by all, that the war was to be the crucial

test of the principle of self-government amongst an Anglo-Saxon people; that if the United States could not maintain itself, it would be plausibly claimed as the bursting of "the republican bubble;" that if it should still fulfil its career as a Republic, the tide of reform in England, certainly, would steadily follow all the phases of its waxing strength.

The classes in England which espoused the cause of the South entered upon as hopeless a task as their allies across the water. Even had the American Republic failed, it would have been seen to be the result of so much *anti-republicanism* as it had retained among its institutions; and, instead of bolstering up aristocratic interests or theories, it would have been a terribly impressive lesson in favour of the inviolability of the rights of the lowest, and a powerful testimony to human equality. But if they could gain nothing in any event of the American war, they may yet find that they could lose much at home by assuming an attitude of rebellion against the established principles and most sacred feelings of the English people. We know that it is the habit in some quarters to deny indignantly that those who sympathized with the South sympathized with slavery. It is perhaps true that our privileged classes would reprove such a vicious excess of their principle as slavery; but it is plainly not true, that the general triumph of slavery would not seem to them as dreadful as the general triumph of democracy. The willingness of the *Times* newspaper, at one time during this struggle, to defend slavery on scriptural grounds; the proclamation of a leading weekly journal, that the negro was now "found out," and proved unfit to be free; and the absence of any protest against Southern slavery by the friends of secession here,—are facts which have fewer off-sets than we could desire. It is true that these gentlemen have, with a degree of unfairness which only the proverbially wide allowance of war can excuse, brought forward everything, except slavery, as the cause and question of the American war; the traditions and convictions of our people made necessary so much stratagem; but there have not been wanting important avowals, which, whilst showing how

far reactionism has penetrated in certain directions, reveal also how universally the cause of the Americans of the North is recognized as being identified with humanity.

The Marquess of Lothian, starting out to prove that the civil war in America originated in difficulties arising from temperament, the manner of electing presidents, and above all, the tariff, is yet, at every step, forced to make admissions, which show that he knows the true nature of the conflict. He tells us (p. 8), in defending the Southerners from the charge of having provoked the war, that "all the provocation" came "from the Northern *abolitionists*." Again (p. 23), "The Southerners made sacrifices for the sake of the Union, at their own expense: the Northerners made theirs at the expense of the negro;" the inevitable deduction from which is that the South was continually making demands favourable to slavery, which the North conceded; the Marquess forgetting, in the eagerness of the thrust, that his sword is two-edged. And to complete the matter, the South is acknowledged (p. 83) to have become entirely identified with the institution: "what had been regarded as an unavoidable evil came to be regarded as a national palladium." But there is no shrinking on that score in the mind of the Marquess. He does not even affect to conceal his contempt for abolitionism. Speaking of New England, he describes it scornfully, as full of "Isms," as welcoming notions which the most visionary dreamers of Europe would reject, and then adds (p. 81) — "It could hardly have been expected, that in such a country the doctrine of abolitionism should have had no place." The tone of all this is unmistakable. We quote these sentences, not to reply to them, but as indicating that those who trust in oppression throughout the world, are no more deceived by all the outcries of the South about "independence," than are those workingmen of the North, who think that any true theory of independence would at once have shown its genuineness by striking off the chains of its own forging. The magnitude and depth of the American struggle is thus clearly disclosed; and if the Pope, the Emperor of the French, and the class in England represented by the Marquess of Lothian, instinctively recognized their friends in the slaveholder and planter, the people of Europe have only additional reasons to feel in the striking down of that workingman, who — having fulfilled the conditions of superiority, was supported by the people of the United States as their president, in

the name of liberty and equality — a blow aimed at their own hearts, and at every hope that is leading them onward and upward.

The Confederates have appealed to the world for sympathy as revolutionists for their independence, and have been never weary of comparing the attitude of the North to that of George III. toward the American colonies in former times. Undoubtedly the civil war was one stage of a revolution, nor is it wonderful that, for the moment, the secession movement gained the applause which the world is not slow in yielding to those who strike for liberty, especially if they strike pluckily, as the Southerners certainly did. But this claim could not stand the test of the sober second thought which has followed that almost critical familiarity with the antecedents and conditions of the struggle, which mankind soon reached as one of the results of the war itself. It became sufficiently plain, that George III. in this case was the evil institution of the South, which that king did so much to foster, and which came at last to be a more formidable despot to America than any king could have been; and the real revolutionists, those who inaugurated and resolutely sustained that anti-slavery revolution, which was meant to be peaceful, but which the Southerners forced to become violent. The Southern movement was thus only a rebellion against a revolution — and that a revolution for liberty and justice. To illustrate this fact, and to trace this new American revolution from its faint beginnings to its present condition and prospect, is our purpose in this article.

In the first volume of Mr. Greeley's History, we have traced, with wonderful clearness and force, by one who has been intimately associated with the political struggles which preceded the war for at least a quarter of a century, the chain of causes which are consummated in the present state of affairs. The essence of every important document from the formation of the Government, and the practical bearing of every event, are succinctly stated; and if we may admire the industry which has enabled the editor of the leading daily newspaper in America to do this at such a time, we may still more admire the spirit of fairness and directness, which are the chief characteristics of his very valuable work. None who read it can wonder at the almost unexampled favour with which it has been received. This volume ends at a point immediately preceding the Peninsular Campaign of General McClellan, in Virginia. Lieutenant-Colonel Fletcher, looking at the whole matter with the eye of a sol-



dier, passes impatiently and blunderingly over the causes of the war, which he deals with in a preliminary chapter, and carries his review of the course of military events down to the time of the advance of McClellan to the Chickahominy, and immediately preceding the disastrous battles before Richmond, which led to the inglorious retirement and ultimate downfall of that commander. Next to Mr. Greeley's work, the *Political History*, by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, must be regarded as the most valuable repository for the future historian. It includes in one volume a classified summary of all important public documents, and of legislation, in both the Washington and Richmond Capitals, from November, 1860, to July, 1864. These works, therefore, enable us to comprehend the parallel military and political events and forces which between them have already formed a characteristic portion of the American epoch, which they promise to consummate.

The construction of a government for the colonies, which had declared and maintained their independence of England, began under a natural reaction. Washington, in a letter to Henry Laurens (July 10, 1782) wrote: "That spirit of freedom, which, at the commencement of this contest, would have gladly sacrificed everything to the attainment of its object, has long since subsided, and every selfish passion has taken its place. It is not the public but private interest which influences the generality of mankind, nor can the Americans any longer boast of an exception." This was, as we have said, natural; the ravages of war, and the debt created by it, must make trade paramount, and under that and the vices which follow in the train of war, the fiery lava of revolution must cool down and harden into the provisions of self-interest and the enactments of economy. A late conservative orator of New England sneered at the Declaration of Independence as "the passionate manifesto of a revolutionary war," and appealed from its "glittering generalities" to the wary "compromises of the Constitution;" it has only been amid the fires of another revolution that those glittering generalities have been revealed as, to use Mr. Emerson's phrase, "blazing ubiquities." The great motives which prevailed to bring about the Convention of 1787, whose object was to supersede the loose articles of confederation and establish "a more perfect Union," were apparently the greater security of all economic interests, and a more complete combination against any attempt at a recovery of the States on the part of England.

At this time, Massachusetts was the only State that held no slaves. By the census of 1790, there was a population in America of a little over 3,000,000, of which nearly 700,000 were slaves, whose relative distribution is shown in the following summary, taken from the same census:—

North.	
New Hampshire . . . . .	158
Vermont . . . . .	17
Rhode Island . . . . .	952
Connecticut . . . . .	2,759
Massachusetts . . . . .	None
New York . . . . .	21,324
New Jersey . . . . .	11,423
Pennsylvania . . . . .	3,737
<hr/>	
Total.	40,370

South.	
Delaware . . . . .	8,887
Maryland . . . . .	103,036
Virginia . . . . .	293,426
North Carolina . . . . .	100,571
South Carolina . . . . .	107,093
Georgia . . . . .	29,264
Kentucky . . . . .	11,830
Tennessee . . . . .	3,817
<hr/>	
Total.	657,527

There is ample proof that slavery was never a source of wealth in the Northern States and that the possession of slaves was rather coveted as an aristocratic distinction. Bancroft has also shown that the Northern slaves were carefully protected under the same roof with the master and his family. There were, indeed, many points in which their condition might be compared to that of the *clients* of ancient Rome. In the South, their treatment was already characterized by those cruelties and degradations which elicited the strong denunciations of the system which are to be found in the works of Jefferson, Washington, and other eminent men who lived in the South. There seems, however, to have been a concurrent testimony as to the evil of the institution, and an implied agreement that each State should, more or less gradually, abolish it. The Northern States were busily engaged in this work of Emancipation at the time of the formation of the Constitution. Vermont framed a State Constitution in 1777, and embodied it in a Bill of Rights, whereof the first article precluded slavery. Massachusetts framed her Constitution in 1780, containing a Declaration of Rights, almost a

paraphrase of the Declaration of Independence, which was held by the Supreme Court of that State, on the first case that arose, to have abolished slavery entirely. In like manner, New Hampshire was held to have abolished slavery by her Constitution, framed in 1783. Pennsylvania passed an Act, March 1, 1780, by which all persons born in that State after that day were to be free at the age of 28. Rhode Island provided that all persons born after March, 1784, should be free. Connecticut, in 1784, passed an Act of Gradual Emancipation. New York provided for gradual emancipation in 1799. In 1817 another Act was passed, providing that there should be no slavery in that State after July 4, 1827, an act by which 10,000 slaves were at once liberated. New Jersey passed an Act in 1804, designed to put an end to slavery, which was so slow, however, in its action that even so late as 1840 the census reported 674 slaves as still in that State. Nearly all of these Acts of Emancipation are accompanied by the prohibition, under severe penalties, of the exportation of slaves. This is a sufficient reply to that slander of the Northern States which declares that they "sold their slaves South, and then abolished slavery." This statement—for which not a shadow of authority has been ever adduced—is made by the Marquess of Lothian concerning Massachusetts:—

"At the time of the Convention (i. e. of 1787) slavery was not the distinguishing mark between North and South, for the Northern States had slaves just as much as their Southern neighbours had.\* There was one exception, and only one. Massachusetts had no slaves. That canny State had come to the perfectly correct conclusion that in her climate slave labour was unprofitable, and that her negroes were an inconvenience. So she had got rid of the 'peculiar institution' by converting them from slaves into. . . freemen? No; into cash."

He elsewhere says: "The first American ship that ever took part in this [slave] traffic sailed from the port of Boston." Though the fame of Massachusetts does not require a vindication from these charges, the recklessness of such a statement, made by a member of the English nobility, merits the severe reproof which a statement of the simple facts will best administer. At a time (1645) when the conscience of the world was as yet asleep so far as the slave-trade was concerned, though one or two Popes

had denounced it, a ship of one Thomas Keyser and one James Smith, sailed "for Guinea to trade for negroes." At once throughout Massachusetts a cry was raised against the two men as malefactors and murderers; Richard Saltonstall, a magistrate, denounced the act as "expressly contrary to the law of God and the law of the country;" the guilty men were committed for the offence; and after advice with the elders, the representatives of the people, bearing "witness against the heinous crime of man-stealing," ordered the negroes to be restored at the public charge "to their native country, with a letter expressing the indignation of the General Court" at their wrongs.\* So much for the justice of the fling at Massachusetts as leading in the colonial slave-trade. As to the other charge, although the Puritans had for a time consented to the authority of British law, which held that *pagans* might be enslaved, we find that so early as 1701 the agitation for emancipation was begun by the instruction given by the town of Boston to its representatives "to put a period to negroes being slaves." In 1780 the slaves were all declared by the Superior Court to be free, without any delay or warning, which would have enabled the few remaining slave-holders to sell their slaves. It is this State—with its proud eminence of having been the first to deal justly, upon moral and religious grounds, with slavery—that is singled out by a British nobleman for denunciation!

The Acts of Emancipation passed by the Legislatures of Northern States, before and after the adoption of the Constitution in 1787, did but express what was understood to be the general sentiment of both North and South, though the South seemed reluctant to convert this sentiment into practical measures. When the convention met to frame the Constitution, slavery inevitably came under its consideration, and it was found that the Southern States had become very deeply involved in the institution, and were determined to demand the utmost indulgence for that which no one was ready to justify. The delegates from South Carolina and Georgia came fully prepared to use the menace of disunion, as a lash over the convention, to secure advantages for slavery; and when the matter came up first, upon the proposition to prohibit the slave-trade, they placed before the convention the alternatives: "No slave-trade—no union." They thus secured the compromise, that the trade should not be prohibited until the

\* Compare the statistics of slavery in 1799, quoted above, with this statement of the Marquess.

\* See Bancroft's "History of the United States," vol. i. p. 132.



year 1808. By similar means, and with less discussion, they secured the compromise that the basis of representation in Congress should be the entire free population of each State, and "three-fifths of all other persons," — *persons* being held to mean *slaves* — a measure which secured a preponderance of Southern representation. To this they succeeded in adding a clause providing that "persons bound to service or labour in any of the United States, escaping into other States, should not thereby be considered discharged from such service or labour, but should be delivered up to the person claiming the same," which was proposed by Mr. Butler, of South Carolina. It will be observed that, whilst these advantages were given to slavery, the terms *slave* and *slavery* were decorously excluded from the Constitution: this was, according to Mr. Madison, "because they did not choose to admit the right of property in man." It was plain that the framers of the Constitution believed that the institution of slavery was dying out of the land, and that, though they might consent to humour it by certain indulgences, these must all terminate in 1808, when slavery, deprived of the traffic which fed it, would perish, and not a dead letter remain in the Constitution to be its epitaph. Nevertheless, it is not to be supposed that these compromises were agreed to without much opposition. Nothing could have reconciled the people of the North to them, but the great and substantial advantage of which they had been the high price. *That advantage had been the establishment of a firm national union with supreme powers.* They consented to enter this narrow gate and straitened way only because they saw, or thought they saw, the spacious halls of liberty and justice in the distance. They knew that, in consenting to that constitution, the Southern States had created a new and sovereign power, which would gradually abolish their own evil institution — for there was a power of self-amendment, by a majority of three-fourths of the States, which would enable it to grow with the growing world. It is a sufficient proof of the absurdity of any theory of secession, that, when this constitution was returned to the several States for ratification, it was met furiously by the entire state-sovereignty party, on the one ground that it demanded the surrender of its sovereignty by each State. No one, at that time, urged that it was an agreement from which any State might withdraw at will. Said Patrick Henry, in the ratifying convention of Virginia, "That this is a consolidated government is demonstrably clear;

and the danger of such a government is, to my mind, very striking." He is met by no denial; but, on the contrary, the president of the convention which framed the Constitution — George Washington — declares that the purpose of that instrument was "the consolidation of our union." In fine, the bitter and long struggles which occurred in various States where the Constitution met with opposition, are inexplicable on any supposition that those States were only called upon to sign a bond from which they might break away at pleasure. Even Mr. Calhoun, in a "Declaration of Principles for South Carolina," drawn up by him in 1828, is forced to admit that his State had, by ratifying the Federal Constitution, "modified its original right of sovereignty, whereby its individual consent was necessary to any change in its political condition, and, by becoming a member of the Union, had placed that power in the hands of three-fourths of the States, in whom the highest power known to the Constitution actually resides."

This, then, was the force of the compact into which the States had entered. Slavery clutched the strength of the hour. Freedom relied on the justice of the age. The South obtained advantages for slavery as long as it should exist, but no security for the continuation of that existence: the North accepted the grub actual, with the golden wings implied. This compromise was not quite noble on the part of the North, although it was natural that it should not fear an institution which all the physicians of State pronounced to be on its death-bed. Bitterly must they atone for it. Two events were to give slavery a new and most unexpected lease of life. The first of these was the invention of the cotton-gin, by Eli Whitney. Whitney was a native of Massachusetts, and a graduate of Yale College, Connecticut, who, in his 27th year, was employed as a tutor in a private family in Georgia. Hearing some gentlemen complain of the depressed state of agriculture in the South, and the impossibility of profitably extending the culture of the green-seed cotton, because of the trouble and expense of separating the seed from the fibre, young Whitney was led to make those efforts at remedying this difficulty, which resulted in the cotton-gin. Hargreaves had invented the spinning-jenny in 1764; Arkwright, the machine for making fine cotton-thread, in 1768; Watt had patented his improvement for obtaining a rotatory motion by his steam-engine in 1782; and all of these stood ready to

re-enforce the cotton-gin when it was invented, in 1795. In 1784 eight bags of cotton shipped to England were seized at the Custom House as fraudulently entered — “cotton not being a production of the United States.” Even in 1790 the export was returned as eighty-one bags. But under the influences mentioned the supply at once doubled, then quadrupled itself, until it rose to the million bales of 1830, and the five millions of 1860. “Under this dispensation,” says Mr. Greeley, “the prices of slaves necessarily and rapidly advanced, until it was roughly computed that each average field-hand was worth so many hundred dollars, as cotton commanded cents per pound. That is, when cotton was worth ten cents per pound, field-hands were worth a thousand dollars each; with cotton at twelve cents they were worth twelve hundred; and when it rose, as it sometimes did even in later days, to fifteen cents per pound for a fair article of middling Orleans, a stout negro, from 17 to 30 years old, with no particular skill but that necessarily acquired in the rude experience of farm labour anywhere, would often bring fifteen hundred dollars on a New-Orleans auction-block.” But another event exercised a vast influence in the rehabilitation of slavery, namely, the purchase of Louisiana from France, by President Jefferson, in 1803. By \$12,000,000 paid France, and \$4,000,000 paid its own citizens, in satisfaction of claims against France, the United States became unquestionable owner of the entire Valley of the Mississippi. Mr. Jefferson freely acknowledged that he had overridden the Constitution in making this purchase, but relied for justification before the country upon the greatness of the interests secured. The great influence which would be exerted by this purchase toward increasing the power and perpetuating the existence of slavery seems to have been suspected by no one. The antecedents of Louisiana, under both Spanish and French rule, had been slaveholding; and when it became a portion of the United States, the great south-western emigration carried slavery deep into the heart of the continent. The Treaty of Cession would, indeed, on a fair construction, have secured the liberty of all in Louisiana, but Napoleon, fresh from the murder of Toussaint, and just baffled in his attempt to re-enslave the negroes of Hayti, was not the one to care about the destiny of the negro in the ceded territory. The reception of this State, occurring only a little before the legal discontinuance of the slave-trade (1808),

opened a vast market for slaves in the more northern slave States. The coast of Guinea was simply transferred to Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky. The negro infant was worth \$100 at birth. In fact, not to go further into this most loathsome and distinctive aspect of American slavery, slave-breeding for purposes of traffic, became a systematic thing in those border States. Under a seemingly humane opposition to the African slave-trade, they sheltered the infernal traffic, and in the war which seems to have singled out the regions where human beings were bred for merchandise for especial devastations, we find only reason to recognize the track of implacable Justice which still, with wheel and rudder, pursues wrong by land and sea.

This resuscitation of slavery was followed by a general corruption of the mercantile classes throughout the United States. The Northern manufacturer, and the warehouse man, were partners with the planter in one firm. Slavery had “managed to clutch one of the most important of the world’s purse-strings, and thenceforth there arose a party rich enough to buy for it a science, a literature, and a gospel. Then slavery leapt from its death-bed, provided its feast, and was received into good society; it sat in its judicial seats, with the ermine on its brow; it sat in the President’s chair; it entered the pulpit, and for it the Bible was clasped with handcuffs, and the very Cross of Christ festooned with chains.” \* The North had its long list of political leaders, who, one by one, deserted the principles of freedom at the demand of slavery. Alluding to the bold declaration of a Georgian congressman, that he would one day call the roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill, Mr Wendell Phillips said, with bitter truth: — “Robert Toombs has already fulfilled his promise, to call the roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill. He calls them to-day: — ‘Daniel Webster — *Here!* Rufus Choate — *Here!* Edward Everett — *Here!* Robert Winthrop — *Here!*’ ”

“Against this frightful usurpation,” says the work just quoted, “the anti-slavery men, though few and often faint, inaugurated a revolution. Spared at first, because of their insignificance, they at length, through much suffering, raised their cause to a sufficient equality with slavery to bring on those tempests which, as Lord Bacon says, may, in the calendars of States, be looked for when things come to an equality, as in the natural world they attend the

\* “Testimonies concerning Slavery,” p. 137.



equinoctia." It is now our purpose to give some account of this moral revolution, whose aim was justice, and whose method was peaceful argument, up to the time when it was forced, by the mad resistance of the South, to record its triumph in blood.

The pioneer of the anti-slavery agitation in America was a devout Quaker, named Benjamin Lundy. Leaving his father's humble home at the age of nineteen, he wandered, about the year 1808, to Wheeling, Virginia, where, during the next four years, he learned the trade of a saddler, and observed the cruelties of slavery. He settled in St. Clairsville, Ohio, afterwards, and in 1815 organized the first anti-slavery society of America, which was called "The Union Humane Society;" and, beginning with five or six members, who met at his own house, within a few months numbered four or five hundred. Some two years after this, the first anti-slavery journal of the States was published at Mount Pleasant, Ohio, by Charles Osborne, Lundy being the chief writer in it: it was called *The Philanthropist*. We next find Osborne editing *The Emancipator*, in Tennessee, and Lundy *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, in Ohio. This latter paper was printed at Steubenville, twenty miles distant from Mount Pleasant, where it was published, and Lundy each week walked that distance to bring back the edition on his back. Afterwards the two papers were united and edited, in Tennessee, by Lundy. In 1823-4 the first American Convention for the abolition of slavery was held in Philadelphia, and Lundy, who was a weak man physically, and very poor, walked all the way (600 miles) and back to attend it. He then resolved to print his paper at Baltimore; and (1824) started out from Tennessee on foot, knapsack on back, for that city. On his way he paused at a Friends' Meeting House, in a pleasant grove, at Deep Creek, North Carolina, and was there moved to give his first public address against slavery. The Friends received his address kindly, and formed then and there an anti-slavery society. Encouraged by this, he went about in that State, speaking to the people, now at a house-raising, then at a militia muster, and was instrumental in forming fourteen anti-slavery societies. He then passed into Virginia, where he met with less success. From this time forward Lundy devoted his life to enlisting writers and speakers throughout the country in the cause he had espoused. Of course, he met with the usual number of mobs, assaults, etc., which, however, in the

anti-slavery movement, are too normal and numerous to be specifically referred to. He died in 1839, when was closed, as Mr. Greeley well says, "the record of one of the most heroic, devoted, unselfish, courageous lives that was ever lived on this continent."

Amongst those whom Lundy had met in his travels throughout the country was a journeyman printer, who had become an editor, and whom he persuaded to go with him (1829) to help edit the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, at Baltimore. This was William Lloyd Garrison, who was then about twenty-four years of age. Having, in the paper at Baltimore, denounced the coastwise slave-trade between that city and New Orleans, and stigmatized certain persons connected with it, he was indicted for "a gross and malicious libel," and, unable to pay the \$50 fine imposed, was cast into prison, where he passed forty-nine days, being released at last, by the payment of the fine and costs, by Arthur Tappan, a wealthy merchant of New York. After this, having met with violence in Baltimore, Garrison repaired to Boston, where the first number of the *Liberator* appeared, January 1, 1830. The paper was very radical. Its motto was, "Our country is the world—our countrymen all mankind." Somewhat later it adopted the motto, "No Union With Slaveholders." It also declared, "The (Federal) Constitution is a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell." The "Garrisonians," as they were distinctively called, refused to vote or hold office, and honestly believed that it was a plain duty to dissolve, by the constitutional method of a convention of states, the compact which permitted slavery. Of course, there were few who could go these lengths. Mr. Greeley enumerates the anti-slavery classes as follows:—

"A very few years, dating from 1832-3, when the New England and American Anti-Slavery Society were formed respectively, sufficed to segregate the American opponents of slavery into four general divisions, as follows: 1.—The Garrisonians aforesaid. 2.—The members of the 'Liberty party,' who, regarding the Federal Constitution as essentially anti-slavery, swore with good conscience to uphold it, and supported candidates who were distinctively, determinedly, pre-eminently champions of 'Liberty for all.' 3.—Various small sects and parties, which occupied a middle ground between the above positions; some of the sects agreeing with the latter in interpreting and revering the Bible as consistently anti-slavery, while refusing with the former to vote. 4.—A large and steadily increasing class who,

though decidedly anti-slavery, refused either to withhold their votes or to throw them away on candidates whose election was impossible, but persisted in voting, at nearly every election, so as to effect good and prevent evil to the extent of their power."

This division of the anti-slavery movement into, as it were, various fingers, gave it greater power; every ingenuity of the defence of slavery was met. The anti-slavery men had little idea beforehand of the general corruption which slavery had superinduced, or of the obstinacy with which every link of the negro's chain was to be defended. The battle assumed a threefold character—ecclesiastical, popular, and political—of each of which we may give a brief account.

The only religious connexion which seems to have preserved a satisfactory record under this touchstone of practical morality is that of the Quakers. In 1696 the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia had admonished Friends against "bringing in any more negroes." In 1754 a minute against the slave-trade was entered, and those of the society who owned slaves were urged to take care for their morals and treat them humanely. In 1774 the Friends directed that all engaging in the slave-trade should be "disowned;" and in 1776 this sentence was extended to the owners of slaves. In 1783 it was shown that there was no case of slaveholding in the Quaker body in America. The Presbyterians, old and new school, the Baptists, Methodists, and minor sects, were much divided on the subject; for a time they seemed to be able to pass resolutions against slavery in the abstract, but gradually were more or less completely conquered by their Southern memberships,—only the Methodists having had vitality enough to be divided into Northern and Southern divisions upon the question of permitting a Bishop to hold slaves. The Roman Catholic and Protestant Episcopal Churches boldly maintained, and do to this day, that slaveholding is no sin at all. These churches, by a vast majority, and with great bitterness, denounced the abolitionists as agitators, schismatics, and infidels. The biblical justification of slavery was much dwelt upon. Accordingly the abolitionists denounced the churches very cordially, and it is certain that the growth of abolitionism has been attended by a gradual weakening of the influences of all churches. The Unitarians, next to the Quakers, seem to have acted with more zeal in behalf of the negroes; and Dr. Channing, who did such brave service, was followed by many faithful and ear-

nest anti-slavery preachers. This body was so associated, indeed, with the movement against slavery, that only three or four Unitarian societies ever existed in the South, and of these the majority were closed for some years before the Rebellion, because ministers could not be found willing to pledge themselves to silence concerning slavery. When Garrison, who seems to have been in some official standing in the Baptist Church, began his exhortations against slavery in Boston, every church was closed against him, and he began speaking in the open air, on Boston Common. Finally, the infidels opened to him the hall in which they held their meetings. Although, of course, there has been a gradual improvement in the tone of the churches, they nevertheless have generally been dragged after leaders who were laymen, and we find, in association with the earlier reformers, no ministers more orthodox than Dr. Channing and Theodore Parker.

The social and popular resistance which the abolitionists had to encounter was terrible, and has left its traces in many deeds of mob violence. In the North, the movements, speeches, and writings of Garrison and his few friends, seem to have excited at first little if any attention; but slavery, with the keen sense of the savage, seems to have laid its ear close to the ground, and to have heard behind these insignificant "fanatics" the tramp of the hosts of a mighty revolution. Before the *Liberator* had been issued a year, and while its subscribers were yet only a few hundreds, the Legislature of Georgia passed an Act offering \$5,000 to whomsoever should bring to trial either of its editors. A requisition was sent to the Mayor of Boston, by a Southern magistrate, for the suppression of the *Liberator*; but the Mayor—evidently not half so farsighted as his Southern friends—returned answer that the paper in question, of which he had plainly never heard before, was not of a character to disturb Southern gentlemen,—that his officers had "ferreted out the paper and its editor, whose office was an obscure hole, his only visible auxiliary a negro boy, his supporters a few insignificant persons of all colours." The Southerners, however, could not share this contempt of the anti-slavery agitators and their movement. The threat of disunion, which had been held over the Constitutional Convention with some success, was again resorted to. "We firmly believe," said the leading newspaper of Georgia (1833), "that if the Southern States do not quickly unite, and declare to the North, if the question of



slavery be longer *discussed* in any shape, they will instantly secede from the Union, that the question must be settled, and very soon, by the SWORD, as the only possible means of self-preservation ;” and the *Richmond Whig* said, “The people of the North must go to hanging these fanatics, *if they would not lose the benefit of the Southern trade*, and they will do it . . . . Depend upon it, the Northern people *will never sacrifice their present lucrative trade with the South, so long as the hanging of a few thousands will prevent it.*” In both Houses of the Legislature of Virginia (1836) it was “*Resolved* — That the non-slaveholding States of the Union are respectfully but *earnestly* requested promptly to adopt *penal enactments*, or such other measures as will *effectually suppress all associations* within their respective limits purporting to be, or having the character of, Abolition Societies.” Our space will not allow us to trace the numerous and cruel mobs which assailed nearly every anti-slavery meeting, in consequence of these Southern threats, from 1833 to 1837. When the triumph of emancipation in the West Indies was secured, GEORGE THOMPSON went to America, to assist in the kindred struggle there. The interference of a “Briton,” in what was held to be a domestic difference, roused the people to fury, and his presence was the invariable occasion of riot, until he was induced to return to England, as introducing a needless cause of exasperation. President Jackson, in his annual message (Dec. 2, 1835), did not hesitate to approve these violent manifestations. “It is fortunate for the country,” said that message, “that the good sense, the generous feeling, and the deep-rooted attachment of the people of the non-slaveholding States to the Union, and to their fellow-citizens of the same blood in the South, have given so strong and impressive a tone to the sentiments entertained against the proceedings of the misguided persons who have engaged in these unconstitutional and wicked attempts, and especially against the emissaries from foreign parts, who have dared to interfere in this matter, as to authorise the hope that those attempts will no longer be persisted in.” Vigorous efforts were made by Governors Edward Everett (of Massachusetts) and Marcy (of New York) to suppress freedom of speech concerning slavery in their States; but with no further results than some vague denunciations of “fanatics” by legislative committees. It was thus felt that Legislature could do nothing so subversive of the traditions of the North as would

alone satisfy the South, and the opponents of the abolitionists betook themselves to the further instigation of mob-violence. But history attests nothing more completely than that the interest which wields the weapon of violence seizes a sword by the blade, and, though it may bruise its adversary with the hilt, much more gashes its own hands. Men of fine powers and great wealth — as Hon. Gerritt Smith and Arthur Tappan — had their honourable feelings aroused by these persecutions, and took their places among the abolitionists; and it was at a meeting called in Boston, to consider the murder of Rev. E. P. Lovejoy, at Alton, Illinois, by slaveholders from Missouri, that Wendell Phillips made his first speech for freedom, and began that career which, more than that of any other individual, has been the means of promoting the favourable reaction which has culminated in the abolition of slavery. To the inspiration which a great and just cause brought to its champions, opposition added the most needed condition of co-operation; the abolitionists became a compact minority, and wearied out the mobs. The disturbances became less bloody and less frequent, whilst the anti-slavery meetings commanded increasing attention by the accession of eloquent men, notably of the incomparable orator, Wendell Phillips. “Eloquence is cheap at the abolition meetings,” said Emerson; and the crowds who attended them in later years confirmed the assertion of the philosopher. Nevertheless, the popular fury did not subside until many devoted men had sealed the cause of emancipation with their blood, and, alas, not until many Northern statesmen had made the unworthy sacrifice of their principles to the insolent demands of slavery.

It has often been asserted that the North was not strictly faithful to the original compact by which the Union was framed; but the truth is notoriously the reverse of this. It was, in fact, the patient determination of the North to fulfil that compact in the letter and spirit which made the leading abolitionists adopt their theory that the Union must be dissolved, an object, however, which they sought to reach through the peaceful formula of a convention of the people of all the States. But in the South the compact was repeatedly violated in the interest of slavery. It has been already stated that President Jefferson purchased the great south-western territory of Orleans from Bonaparte, which was cut up into slave States, and that he openly acknowledged the unconstitutionality of that pur-

chase. At Charleston, South Carolina, July 29th, 1835, the United States' mails were rifled, and a large quantity of matter, supposed to be anti-slavery, burnt; President Jackson's Post-Master General accepting such action in the following words:—

"By no act or direction of mine, official or private, could I be induced to aid, knowingly, in giving circulation to papers of this description, directly or indirectly. We owe an obligation to the laws, but a higher one to the communities in which we live; and, if the former be permitted to destroy the latter, it is patriotism to disregard them."

In the same year, South Carolina passed an act by which every coloured person found on board any vessel entering her ports was to be seized and lodged in jail; there to remain until the vessel was cleared for departure, when said coloured person or persons should be restored to said vessel, on payment of the cost and charges of arrest, detention, and subsistence. This act bore so heavily upon the vessels of Massachusetts, that this State resolved to institute legal proceedings in the United States District Court of South Carolina, to test the constitutionality of the act; and the Hon. Samuel Hoar was commissioned by the Governor of Massachusetts to go to South Carolina for that purpose; whereupon the Legislature of the latter State formally "resolved, that the emissary sent by the State of Massachusetts" should be compelled immediately to leave the State of South Carolina, and the authorities resolved themselves into a kind of mob, to drive out this eminent gentleman, who was accompanied by his daughter. How such an event was related to the Constitution may be judged by reference to Art. iv. § 2 of that instrument, which provides that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States." The anti-slavery men of the North bore this patiently, and only raised another degree their determination to achieve that sublime revenge which the poet Whittier invoked on that occasion:

"Have they chained our free-born men?  
Let us unchain theirs."

The abolitionists were a class which any monarchy on the continent of Europe would have exiled. They had that perilous *πονηρὸν* outside of the Government which few Governments can permit. The short arm of the lever, with which they moved the country, was the Republican party. Mr. Sumner was related to Mr. Garrison, as Jules Favre to Ledru Rollin. The union

of the States was, from the first, threatened only by the insatiable hunger of slavery for fresh territory. It had already learned what an increase the pecuniary value of slaves, and of political power, ensued upon the opening of new territory to it, by its extension into Louisiana; and when Arkansas had been devoured, the hunger grew to lust. The first serious resistance it encountered was in the agitation which led to the adoption of the Missouri Compromise in 1820—the stormiest chapter in the political history of the United States. At that time, John Adams, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson (December 18th, 1819), said:—

"The Missouri question, I hope, will follow the other waves under the ship, and do no harm. I know it is high treason to express a doubt of the perpetual duration of our vast American empire, and our free institutions; and I say as devoutly as Father Paul *esto perpetua*: and [yet] I am sometimes Cassandra enough to dream that another Hamilton, another Burr, may rend this mighty fabric in twain, or perhaps into a leash; and a few more choice spirits of the same stamp might produce as many nations in North America as there are in Europe."

The threatened disaster was temporarily avoided by the adoption of the *Missouri Compromise*, so called, by which slavery was permitted in the great new State of Missouri, but prohibited in all that portion of the territory out of which it was carved, north of 36° 3'. It was hoped by the conservatives that the passage of this measure would for ever take the slavery-discussion out of the Houses of Congress, and, notwithstanding an infraction of it by the South,\* it did manage to prevent any formidable conflict for full twenty years. The great pro-slavery reaction had prevailed over all the land, and the abolitionists could scarcely produce a sensation in Congress by sending in petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, etc.; which were at first received with derision, and at length forbidden even to be read. This long political truce on the slavery issue was destined to be broken by another exasperation of slavery's accursed lust for empire. We need not repeat here that disgraceful history of the entrance of filibusters into Texas—originally through the generosity of Mexico

\* In 1836 a considerable section of the territory beyond the original western boundary of Missouri was added to the State of Missouri, so quietly as not to attract attention. By this palpable violation of the Missouri Compromise, slaveholding Missouri acquired 3,026 square miles of rich land, cut up now into six counties, which contained, in 1860, 70,503 inhabitants, of whom 6,699 were slaves.



in bestowing grants of land upon them — the revolution of that territory by slaveholders, and its annexation in the interest of slavery. Against that measure Daniel Webster lifted his voice, in warning. The recklessness of slavery — its willingness to lie, rob, and murder, in order to reach its ends — were laid bare in that transaction more than in anything else. There was as yet, however, no Republican party, and, consequently, no adequate opposition to the annexation of Texas under the vigorous advocacy of “His Accidency” \* John Tyler. That virgin country, which the measure of universal emancipation, passed by Mexico some twenty years before, had protected, was helplessly bound, and soon became a prey to the Southern dragon. Nevertheless, out of this outrage came the compensation of a party which revealed the important fact that the abolition movement was now represented within the pale of the Constitution. The champions of slavery had some misgivings, when, in 1848, a Free-Soil Convention met at Buffalo, New York, and, resolving “That Congress had no more power to make a slave than to make a king; no more power to institute or establish slavery, than to institute or establish monarchy,” presented the names of Van Buren and Adams as candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency: they had still greater misgivings when those candidates polled, out of the 2,872,056 votes cast, 291,342. When, soon after this Presidential campaign — in which Taylor and Fillmore were elected — the question of a Government for the territory of Oregon came up, freedom was conciliated by a defeat of the bill which would have given the best portion of it to slavery. Then came on the fierce conflict about California, which, having fulfilled the conditions of population, etc., requisite for the formation of a State, asked to be admitted with a free constitution into the Union. President Taylor, a moderate Whig, having died as suddenly and mysteriously as his predecessor Harrison, slavery found in Millard Fillmore a compliant tool; and though California had to be admitted as a free State, it was not without the addition of offsets for slavery, in the admission of slavery into Utah and New Mexico, and the passage of the odious

Fugitive Slave Bill, drafted by Mason, of Virginia, late Confederate Minister to England. The era of slave-hunting and kidnapping which followed this “Compromise of 1850,” as it was called, was a terrible one for the negroes of the North. In the first year of its operation, more slaves were dragged from Northern refuges into bondage than in the sixty years preceding; but there was nothing that the warmest foe of slavery could have more ingeniously devised to produce a general disgust toward slavery in the Northern States. Hitherto slavery had been a distant evil, and its cruelties were declared to be mythic; but now its hideous form was seen dragging innocent men and women through the streets of Northern cities to enslave them, and there was a deep and wide revulsion of feeling. A most important anti-slavery reaction began. It did not make itself fully felt in the Presidential canvass of 1852, chiefly because it nominated, as candidates, two very radical men (Hale and Julian), and because the Whigs nominated men (Scott and Graham) who were, to a moderate degree, satisfactory to the opponents of slavery, and were more generally voted for, as being more likely to be successful. In this election Franklin Pierce was elected — a man of absolute servility to the slave-power. Under him slavery conceived the fatal design, to itself, of nationalizing its power. To this end it attacked that line which had been established by the Missouri Compromise and which, for over thirty years, had been a bulwark against its North-western encroachments. A bill to sweep away this limitation was, to use an American phrase, “engineered” through Congress, by S. A. Douglass. Immediately emigrants from the North and the South poured into Kansas, where the Bill decreed that the existence of slavery should depend upon the vote of settlers, and that territory soon became the theatre of a brutal civil war — slavery having determined to carry by force, and with the assistance of military aid from President Pierce, the polls which it was vain to try and carry by numbers. Free-state settlers were put to the sword; voters who would not vote for slavery were murdered; the villages of immigrants from the free States were burnt after their houses and churches had been plundered. Under this the tide of freedom advanced, and in 1856 the democratic (pro-slavery) candidate, James Buchanan, was confronted with an ominous array of 1,341,264 votes for the radical Republican, J. C. Fremont, against his 1,838,169 — many of which were notoriously fraudulent. Through the persist-

\* John Tyler, of Virginia, who became President by the death of Harrison, in 1841, one month after the inauguration. Slavery secured the immediate annexation of Texas by the change; and though Mr. Tyler was popularly entitled “His Accidency,” there has always been, among intelligent Americans, a suspicion that his accession to power was *not* “accidental.”



ence and bravery of the free State men, Kansas was brought in as a free State. Slavery did not forego, however, its dream of nationalizing itself. With the favour of its new Presidential tool, it betook itself to the Supreme Court, the judges of which were, with one exception, notoriously pro-slavery in their opinions, and a majority of them slaveholders. A fictitious case was made up, concerning an old negro of St. Louis, Missouri, named Dred Scott—who was made to bring suit for his freedom, on the ground that he had been taken by his master into territory made free by the Missouri Compromise—and the Supreme Court, through Chief Justice Taney, declared him still a slave. The Chief Justice went out of his way to declare that negroes “are not included, and were not intended to be included under the word ‘citizens’ in the Constitution, and can, therefore, claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States;” also, that “they had, for more than a century before, been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that *they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect*; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit.” It was thus decided flatly that the Constitution carried slavery with it wherever it went; President Buchanan congratulated the country that the long agitation was settled; and slavery prepared to celebrate its victory by raising a new star to its flag, to be called Slavery.

In the midst of slavery’s festivities, however, about this time, there darted forth a hand of flame, which wrote on its walls some old sentiments from the Declaration of Independence, and warned it that there were some who, despite the decisions of the Supreme Court, still believed that “all men are born equal.” Captain John Brown, having stood and fought bravely in Kansas until he saw it a free State, appeared in the town of Harper’s Ferry, Virginia, with seventeen white and five black comrades, occupying the United States Arsenal, holding the town two days, all for the liberation of the slaves! So intense was the suspicion of greater armies behind, so fearful the excitement, that troops enough of the United States and of Virginia were poured into Harper’s Ferry, not only to capture these twenty-three, but to have encountered a fair-sized foreign invasion. When these rescuers were conquered, and the three or four

who were not killed at once were in Virginian dungeons, the Governor of the invaded State still preserved a large garrison for the gaol. The weakness of slavery had been made manifest. It is said that the Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, a radical Republican representative, was sneeringly asked at the time, by a member from Virginia, “Well, Mr. Stevens, What do you think of John Brown?” “He is a fool, sir!” “Why, I thought you would call him a hero!” A fool sir! Think of the man going to capture the State of Virginia with *twenty-two* men. Why didn’t he take *thirty*? then he’d have *done* it!” The long trial; the hanging of Brown and his few surviving companions all wounded; the extended Congressional investigations; the drilling of militia throughout Virginia, and some other States,—all told that a terrible fear had seized upon slavery. “Virginians,” said Wendell Phillips, “did not tremble at an old gray-headed man at Harper’s Ferry; they trembled at a John Brown in every man’s conscience.” The heroism with which John Brown hurled himself against slavery, to free the slave, deeply affected the nation; and the “Southern chivalry” lost any remnant of *prestige*, it might have had when he was hung.

Among the papers of the late Theodore Parker was found a letter, written from Canada, where his expedition was planned by John Brown, in which he said: “I expect to achieve a great victory, even though it be like the last victory of Sampson.” The death of this great man did indeed produce a remarkable effect. For the months that he lay in prison, previous to his execution, his conversations, appeals, etc., on the subject of slavery, were reported in all the newspapers of the nation, and were repeated in pulpits and from platforms. For some months he preached from every pulpit and edited every paper. His fortitude and heroism won applause from his enemies, and the Governor of Virginia, under whom he was executed, said, “He is firm, truthful, intelligent—the gamest man I ever saw.” That slavery had only a scaffold for qualities like these, was not without its lesson for the North. When his body was borne home for burial, it was followed by the friends of freedom, who mourned for him as a martyr. On the South the effect of his “raid,” as they called it, was no less noteworthy. For the first time, the intensity and determination of the enemies of slavery was revealed to them, and they scented the battle from afar. John B. Floyd, of Virginia, was at that time Secretary of War, and,



as is now known, he began at once to send arms from Arsenals of the United States to the South.\* It is certain that the Southern leaders had fully determined upon secession, and only awaited the appearance of some occasion which would enable them to "fire the Southern heart" and unite their states in the movement.

How often does the field of compromise prove the field of battle! When, thirty years before, the North and the South agreed upon a line in the Missouri territory, on either side of which slavery and freedom should rest and be thankful, they ignored the fact that their line pierced through the heart of humanity. Slavery, with its insatiable lust of territory, with its ambition for nationalism, with its new Dred Scott decision in its hand, did, with a madness which an old Hebrew prophet would have attributed to a divinely-ordered temptation of the devil, sweep away that line. The result was, that the whole subject of slavery extension was brought up again for decision before the people. The anti-extensionists put forward Abraham Lincoln as their candidate. He was selected because, whilst a man of Southern birth, and therefore not liable to the charge of sectional unfriendliness to the South, he was a thoroughly-convinced champion of non-extension, who had surrendered political prospects for his principles, and was an honest man. No man had ever uttered before the American people the issue before them more simply and thoroughly. He showed that the admission of slavery into new territories was virtually the enslavement of men. "It means," he said, "that if A wishes to make B a slave, C has no right to interfere." But he also represented something more important —

Mr. E. A. Pollard, sometime editor of the *Richmond Examiner*, who was in public employment at Washington throughout the administration of Buchanan, says, in his "Southern History of the war:" "It has been supposed that the Southern people, poor in manufactures as they were, and in the haste for the mighty contest that was to ensue, would find themselves but ill provided with arms to contend with an enemy rich in the means and munitions of war. This advantage had been provided against by the timely act of one man. Mr. Floyd of Virginia, when Secretary of War, under Mr. Buchanan's administration, had by a single order, effected the transfer of 115,000 improved muskets and rifles from the Springfield (Massachusetts) Armoury, and Watervliet Arsenal to different arsenals at the South." The same officer had, by a similar "timely" act, placed at the head of the United States forces, sent ostensibly to protect the Texan frontier from Indians, one whom he knew would throw them all into the hands of the South in case of collision; nor did General Twiggs betray his confidence. When Texas seceded he turned over to General Ben McCulloch his entire army, and all the fortifications, horses, &c., which he held; an act by which the United States lost one-half of its army, and over two million dollars' worth of military property.

namely, the resolution of the Northern people that there should be no more delusive compromises on this subject, but that it should be at once and for ever settled. He acknowledged also, boldly, that this would be a blow at the life of slavery itself.

"We are now," said Mr. Lincoln (1858), "far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot permanently endure half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I *do* expect that it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

In the spring of 1860 the various parties held conventions to organize their forces, declare their principles, and nominate candidates for the approaching presidential campaign. The Republicans met at Chicago, Illinois, and, with a declaration of broad anti-slavery and anti-extension principles, nominated Mr. Lincoln. In April the pro-slavery party, which in America calls itself the Democracy, met at Charleston, South Carolina, and was at once thrown into contention by the determination of the extreme Southerners to contend for the principle of the Dred Scott decision, that slavery already existed in the territories, because the Constitution carried slavery with it wherever it went, and that the territorial legislatures had no more right to prohibit slavery in them than Congress. The Northern wing declared that such a principle would be suicidal in the North; that they could not go before the people on such an issue, and warned the Southerners that if they did not concede the principle of the bill which abolished the Missouri Compromise, that the people of the territories must decide for themselves the existence or non-existence of slavery among them, the election of a Republican President was almost certain. Neither party did or could yield, and the result was a split, the Southern wing nominating Mr. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, and the other

Mr. Douglass, of Illinois. It was sufficiently evident that the Southern leaders intended the inevitable result of this decision — the election of a Republican President — on the ground stated at the time by its Washington organ, that “if Lincoln triumphs the result cannot fail to be a South united in her own defence — the only key to a full and, we sincerely believe, a peaceful and happy solution of the political problem of the slavery question.”

Confident that the alarm of the planters at the triumph of the policy of restriction, which would girdle slavery, and the humiliation of the proud Virginians and Carolinians at the election of an anti-slavery President, would secure a united movement throughout the South for secession; knowing that there was a strong conviction in the minds of many earnest Northern men that their complicity with slavery should end, though it cost the Union; aware that, during its long possession of the general government, slavery had been able, secretly, to disarm the North and arm the South, so that resistance would be at once seen to be futile, the Southern leaders looked forward with a delight which, in South Carolina, expressed itself in toasts to the success of the Republican candidate in the coming election as the signal for the formation of a grand Southern empire, with slavery for its corner-stone, a solution fondly believed to prove “peaceful and happy.”

To the long head and the stout heart of Abraham Lincoln, humanity owes that the earth is not at this moment cursed with such an empire. Nothing was easier than for a weak president to have demoralized the North at that moment. The majority were already calling for a compromise, and the anti-slavery men, fearing another compromise above all else, were showing what great advantages there would be in parting with the South. The leading men, and pulpits, and presses, were against the coercion of the South. But Abraham Lincoln understood the heart and power of the American people better. To all these voices he said — No; this Union is to be preserved, and that not by any compromise! With surprise and pain the country heard this; but when the South fired upon the flag of Fort Sumter, the nation rose up “with the war-cry of the first revolution on its lips.”

The Anti-Slavery Revolution had encountered, with what success we have seen, the social, the religious, and the political forces which had opposed it; by a long and weary path it had now reached its final ordeal — War.

When it became evident that there was to be a civil war, the advantages seemed so clearly to be on the side of the North that the movement of the South excited surprise and contempt throughout the world. According to the census of 1860, the population of the free States and Territories was 19,128,143; and that of the slave States, including the District of Columbia, 12,315,372. All the free States adhered to the Union, whilst of the slave States four, having an aggregate population of 3,137,282, did not unite with the movement for secession. The population of the States which declared themselves actually in revolt was 9,103,014; but of these, 3,520,902\* were slaves, who, it was generally predicted, would certainly take the occasion of war to gain their freedom by insurrection. In manufactures, commerce, shipping, and general wealth, the preponderance on the side of the Union was vast. The columns of the *Times* newspaper of that date show sufficiently the popular incredulity in this country of the ability of the South to maintain itself; whilst in the Northern States of America the same confidence uttered itself in “ninety-day” prophecies, and in some sad mistakes.

The fact was, that in the beginning of the war there was a substantial balance of advantages in favour of the South. In the first place, the Government of the United States had long been in the hands of the South. For four years the rebel chief had been Secretary of War, and had resigned that office only to be followed by Mr. Floyd, of Virginia. Not only did both of these carry on, through several years, the process of disarming the North and arming the South — another official, at the same time, scattering the navy to the ends of the earth, — but these men were personally acquainted with the officers of the army and navy, knew whom they might trust, and how others might be purchased. The secession movement was at once followed by a sweeping surrender of garrisons, forts, forces, and munitions — only one or two generals — as at Sumter — making a feeble resistance, and others — as at Norfolk — showing utter imbecility. In the second place the Washington Government had so long been administered in the interest of slavery, that the departments were full of disloyal persons, who, maintaining their positions by loud professions of devotion to the Union, conveyed every kind of military intelligence to the enemy. General Robert Lee had

\* The number of slaves in the United States, by census 1860, was 3,953,524.



been for many years on the staff of the Lieutenant-General-in-Chief of the United States, and remained long enough, before resigning, to possess himself of whatever plans or ideas his superior in rank had. It was fully ascertained by Federal prisoners, after the battle of Bull Run, and boasted of by the Confederates, that nothing belonging to the plans of Lieutenant-General Scott was unknown to the camp of the secessionists. In the third place, slavery was in itself a military training to the South. It implied constant patrols, familiarity with violence, a paucity of railroads, and other internal improvements, which made every Southerner a horseman, and vast primæval woods, with abundance of game, making each a good marksman. The conditions of Northern society were precisely opposite to these. Military ambition, cultivated in the South, was despised in the North, and for many years the leading military positions and officers of the country were filled by Southerners, who, on the breaking out of the war, generally went South. General Scott himself was a Virginian, who was originally in favour of letting the "wayward sisters depart," and always half-hearted in the war. The North was at first not only without arms, but was forced to fall back upon civilian generals. In the fourth place, there was a large and powerful party of pro-Southern and pro-slavery men in the North, who were in full sympathy with the South, and who continually prevented the Government from taking any step which would have made slavery a weakness to the South, as encouraging the slaves to escape. The four slave States which still held to the Union had only a loyalty conditioned on the careful preservation of slavery, so that they impeded its movements more than helped them. They were for a long time influential in securing such a policy of rendition and repression toward the slaves as to prevent any accession of them to the Northern lines, and sealed up what might have been the most important source of information to the North. Consequently, in the fifth place, the negroes, remaining as usual at work upon the farms and plantations, proved the chief military strength of the South. Whilst every Northern soldier who enlisted was missed as a labourer at home, the negro at the South, working upon the farm, enabled the South to make the widest draft upon its white population. The negro-women worked in the fields as well as the men, and these labourers were supported upon one-third as much as a white labourer or citizen at the North

would require; thus making, in addition to the advantages above indicated, the mere numbers of the South far more nearly equal than would appear from the figures of the census.

Whilst Jefferson Davis showed from the first his long familiarity with the conditions under which the war was to be fought, Mr. Lincoln gave unmistakable evidence that in his long seclusion at Springfield, he, had gained no means of gauging the forces which were about to work in the impending conflict. His first call, for 75,000 men to serve three months, was the result of a fearful mismeasurement of the Southern movement and resources, and was responded to by his enemy with derision. The terrible disaster which resulted from all this, opened the eyes of the Government, in a great measure, to the difficulty and extent of the task before it. As the Americans have raised the highest monument of the first Revolution on the spot — Bunker Hill — where they were defeated, so they may well build one at Bull Run, as the spot where a fearful defeat and humiliation taught their Government the necessity of putting forth its greatest energies. It was followed by a call for 500,000 volunteers to serve for three years. Arrests of the openly disloyal at the North were made. Large sums were voted by the Congress for the prosecution of the war. Nevertheless, the Government was not ready to take the step which alone could have prevented this force from being wasted. The battle of Bull Run had been lost, through the failure of General Patterson to engage the Confederate, General Johnston; and no explanation of this suspicious conduct having been given, the abolitionists very naturally reminded the Government that General Patterson was so earnestly pro-slavery that, when Fort Sumter was fired upon, he (General Patterson) had only exhibited the United States' flag when forced to do so, by a mob in Philadelphia. But the President had determined that the relation of States or individuals to slavery should not be made a test of loyalty — declaring that he held the man to be loyal who was willing to shoot and be shot for his country — and although Patterson was superseded, a hundred Pattersons remained to cripple the North in the field. Amongst the generals of this character was, notably, General McClellan. This general began his career in West Virginia, by a proclamation levelled not at the rebels, but at the negroes, to whom he announced his determination to "crush them with an iron hand," if they should attempt to rise and claim their free-

dom. The Democracy of the Northern States was at that time making a great noise over the alleged military failures of the Republican Government, and partly as a conciliation of them, partly because the North had so few other generals by education, this half-hearted man was given the command of the great army of the Potomac, when General Scott, through age and infirmity, resigned the command. He assumed command, July 25th, 1861, and for one year was a dead-weight upon the heart and power of the country. The "iron hand" with which he had promised to crush the negroes was covered with the softest of gloves when a rebel was to be dealt with. His idea of duty, with the fine army of 150,000 men entrusted to him, with which to take Richmond, seemed to be confined to the guarding of mansions deserted by their former heads, for the Confederate service, and the rendition of fugitive negroes to disloyal masters. From month to month he sat motionless before Richmond, whilst to the impatient country every kind of excuse for the paralysis was exhausted. He was "waiting for the roads to get better;" they got better; "for the leaves to fall;" they fell; "for fair weather;" it came; and yet there was no onward movement. Meantime, his army became fearfully decimated by the diseases incidental to tide-water Virginia. It is difficult to believe that the waste of this noble army and the most precious year were due to M'Clellan's incapacity or cowardice. It seems but too plain, that political motives and insidious advices were at work; that it had slowly become evident to him that the military conquest of the South would imply the death of slavery, and that he was already acting—or rather sitting still—with reference to the candidature of the pro-slavery reactionists at the North, which was subsequently awarded him, and which he certainly had fairly earned. To his camp there came a favourite band of minstrels—the Hutchinsons—who sang to the measure and music of Luther's hymn, a song by Whittier, which the soldiers liked to hear, the first verse of which is as follows:—

"We wait beneath the furnace-blast  
The pangs of transformation:  
Not painlessly doth God recast  
And mould anew the nation.  
Hot burns the fire  
Where wrongs expire;  
Nor spares the hand  
That from the land  
Uproots the ancient evil."

The Hutchinsons had gone by consent of

the Secretary of War; they had been welcomed also by M'Clellan; but when he heard of this song, he at once issued an order, banishing them from the limits of his command. This little incident really explains the sad year. At length M'Clellan was compelled to make a movement towards Richmond; but it was evidently not done with any idea of entering that capital. While his soldiers were fighting and suffering frightfully, he was on a gun-boat in the James River, enjoying his wine and cigar, out of harm's way; and, in short, the ingenuity of his failure was only equalled by that with which he and his friends tried to make it appear that the failure was attributable to interference with his plans by the authorities at Washington, who were, indeed, seriously amenable to the charge of not having interfered with those plans to the extent of removing the general who had conceived them. The heavy tidings of the seven disasters before Richmond came to the North on the eve of Independence Day (July 4), and the festival became a day of deepest mourning.

Disheartening as was this dreary year, with its fearful climax of a ruined army, it could not fail to bring some compensation to those who had an unconquerable purpose. Those who desired that the Rebellion should be put down without harm to slavery could not deny that their method had been tried by commanders of their own opinions, and that it had failed. The President could not be accused of conducting the war for party ends, if he now tried a more energetic and radical policy. Moreover, the delusion that there was as yet a large party at the South favourable to the Union, which needed to be strengthened by conciliation, was dispelled, and the loyalty of the negroes to the Northern cause, and their willingness and ability to assist it, had been shown in many ways. It became evident to the Government, after the failure of M'Clellan, that it must destroy slavery and avail itself of the co-operation of the slaves to ensure success; but, owing to the necessity of carrying with it the four slave states which yet adhered to the Union, it proceeded very slowly and cautiously in this direction. That the Government and the Congress were anti-slavery, and disposed to exercise their constitutional power against slavery, apart from mere military expediency, is proved by the promptness with which they emancipated the slaves of the District of Columbia, of all United States' territories, and abolished the fugitive slave law. Nothing but military necessity could justify the setting aside of the codes which



protected slavery in the States, and it is not to be wondered that the loyal slaveholders, and their Northern party, were slow to perceive this military necessity. The President (July, 1862) called together the representatives of the non-seceding slave states, and urged them solemnly to use their influence with their respective states to secure the acceptance of the proposition for gradual and compensated emancipation, which Congress, in accordance with a message sent by him, had passed. To this appeal twenty of those representatives responded angrily, in the negative; seven declared that they would appeal to their states for a fair deliberation on the subject; and two met the proposition with favour. The steps which had already been taken concerning slavery were, first, that no soldier should be allowed to return a fugitive slave; next, some time after, that any slave which had been used against the Northern army should be held to be free; and, later, that the slave of any disloyal person should be so held. On September 22, 1862, the world was startled by the President's proclamation, deciding that he would, on the following January 1, issue an edict liberating all slaves in any state or district where there should remain armed resistance to the United States laws. On the day named, the proclamation was issued.

The utterance of this proclamation was the signal for a political conflict of unsurpassed vehemence, which, beginning with the year 1863, continued without intermission until the 7th of November, 1864, when it was concluded by the victory of the Republicans, who re-elected Mr. Lincoln. The President knew that the decided adoption of an anti-slavery policy would cause the formation, into a compact opposition, of all the pro-slavery elements of the country. He proceeded cautiously. He did not remove the feeble generals of Democratic sympathies—not even General McClellan, who was retained some months after his failures in Virginia, in a restricted command. The resuscitation which the armies required made an interval in which this could be done without serious harm. It became the duty of McClellan to publish to the army the President's proclamation of emancipation, which he did in language which indicated his want of sympathy with the measure, and at once marked him as the standard-bearer of the political opposition. He at length disobeyed orders so flagrantly that the President was forced to remove him, when he was at once taken up by the "Copperheads" as they were generally called, and

"lionized." The "Copperheads" took the ground, that the South could yet be brought back by conciliation, negotiation, and compromise; that the President, by over-riding the Constitution and making war upon the domestic institutions of the Southern states,—inciting servile insurrection, &c.,—had united them as one man, and that they would all return, if a president were elected who promised their former security. On the other hand there arose a dissatisfaction among the radical republicans and abolitionists, based upon Mr. Lincoln's slowness and hesitation in dealing with slavery, a dissatisfaction which had already come to its head in a strong party which gathered chiefly around Major-General Fremont. The "Copperheads" had considerable strength in the Congress, and used it in impeding, so far as they could, the voting of supplies to the armies, and in urging measures for the institution of negotiations for peace with the South—their real object being to gain delays until they could obtain a president who would reverse the anti-slavery policy of Mr. Lincoln's government. But events could not be delayed. Negroes crowded by thousands to the Federal lines. The occurrence of fresh disasters made it necessary that these negroes should be enlisted; and both justice and common sense required that Congress should pass a measure emancipating the families of negroes so enlisted. The negroes fought magnificently, and won favour everywhere. Slavery was fast dying by inevitable causes. Some military victories in the south-west—notably, the capture of Vicksburg—decided the republicans to nominate Mr. Lincoln for another term; and the nomination of General McClellan, by the "Copperheads," induced the radicals to forego their preference for Mr. Fremont.

Re-elected by an overwhelming vote of his countrymen, freed from any possible political "fire in the rear," the President had no longer any reason to halt in the work of emancipation. The cry for "peace" was hushed, and there was no path open but that of vigorous war. The South was giving signs of exhaustion, and the future was radiant with the auspices of victory. The President shared the enthusiasm of the people; half-hearted generals were removed, whole-hearted ones sent to the front; city after city—Atlanta, Savannah, Charleston, Columbia—fell, and state after state was conquered; and at length the Union banner floated over the Confederate capital itself, with the chief armies of the vanquished Slavery-Rebellion held as prisoners-of-war beneath it.

Self-conquest in the North had gone hand in hand with conquest in the South. Maryland, Missouri, West Virginia, and Tennessee had abolished slavery; Kentucky, by her leading journals and her governor, had begun a movement for the same end; Illinois and Ohio had abolished civil restrictions upon negroes; the street-cars of New York had resolved to admit negroes with whites; and the Government at Washington had purged itself, so far as it could at that time, by proposing to the States an amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting for ever the existence of slavery in the United States. The signs of this great conversion were appearing everywhere. The flag of the Union — its one stain almost faded out — floated over Sumter again. The nation was filled with unutterable joy, as, on the Dial of Growths, the rank weed of slavery and the blood-red flower of war closed together, and the new hour was marked by the unfolding of a pure Peace. But there was, in the ecstasy of this proud moment, a lurking danger. The anti-slavery revolution was not yet consummated. The anti-slavery amendment yet lacked for adoption the votes of four or five states. There were yet thrice as many slaves actually held as in 1776. But, more formidable than any of these facts, there was a great spirit of clemency and conciliation sweeping through the North; and those, North and South, who wished to preserve as much of the old slave power as they could, were already manœuvring to preserve the caste of the slave-owners, and to reconstruct the State governments of the South out of the fragments of those that had already crumbled through inherent rottenness. General Banks had already shown that disposition to restore states on the basis most desired by planters, which would have been prolific of evils. The negroes were to be, indeed, not slaves, but they were to be in the political power of their former masters — converted from treason to loyalty by the hope of saving their estates — a power under which they could have been oppressed to almost any extent so soon as the military occupation had been replaced by civil law, without any infraction of the laws abolishing slavery in its old form. There was every reason to apprehend that when the Federal power was withdrawn, and the late masters had exclusively the military and political power, the old wrong might survive in some form of serfdom, or enforced contracts with negroes, to be called by some decorous name, to harden gradually into a cruel and dangerous oppression, as slavery had done before. The chief danger

was that this conciliatory spirit of the American people had already taken the shape, in the mind of the President, whom all were ready to follow, of a plan of reconstruction which must inevitably have preserved the *caste* which had grown out of slavery. He had already decided to issue a new proclamation of amnesty in this sense, which the people were ready to receive and applaud; and if, as has been stated, the order of General Weitzel, and the plan of reconstruction proposed by General Sherman, were based upon views and wishes expressed by President Lincoln, there is good reason to fear that this sultry clemency threatened the whole harvest of the war with blight. Was that noble Revolution which had conquered, in succession, indifference, social and ecclesiastical hostility, mobs, majorities, armies, to be lost now by a false and merciless mercy? Was the sword which had cloven iron bars to fail now in piercing the soft veil of sentiment? If there was any point where a great movement for humanity was vulnerable, it would be just here. But out of the darkness emerged the hand of destiny, to rescue the American nation from this last peril. It was decreed that slavery itself should blot out the unpublished proclamation of amnesty, and write, in the blood of the heart which was too kind to utter it, that death-warrant which it and its caste deserved, and which alone could fitly crown the sacrifices of so many weary years. At the very moment when the joyful nation was wreathing the laurel and evergreen of the victor and the patriot around the brow of their noble and gentle President, slavery slew him in cold blood. In a moment, the twenty million hearts that just now meditated indulgence demand implacable justice. The body of the murdered President passes from city to city, and from state to state, and the grief-stricken people swear over it that not one vestige of the infernal wrong shall remain in the land. The wild and guilty passions which the long outrages upon human nature have engendered gather themselves into a last fearful stroke, the fit climax of their horrible history, and the policy of Southern reconstruction is remitted to one who, more than any loyalist in America, knows the nature of the monster with whose last writhings of desperation America has to deal.

Andrew Johnson, who has had the rope of a rebel mob around his neck, who has had a son laid in the grave, and a daughter shot down at his door, is now the President of Slavery's own election, and the last cloud clears away from that future of America



which too much clemency alone had imperilled.\*

We are not of those who have feared, at any time, that the heroes of humanity in America are in danger of being provoked, even by the fiendish assassination of a beloved leader, to lend themselves to a savage or vindictive policy. President Lincoln is not the first anti-slavery martyr over whose grave they have journeyed to their noble goal. The blood of Lovejoy and of John Brown cried from the ground, only to inspire them to a new devotion to justice, and that of the martyr-President will plead for nothing lower. That their labours and sacrifices have culminated in so purifying the banner of the United States that slaveholders loathed it, and slaves prayed for a sight of it, that the Presidents who were known only as slave hounds were at last superseded by one worthy to die for freedom,—these will be held by them as the costly certificates of their well-earned triumph, and be set as a bow on the receding cloud. The subsiding waters of rebellion will leave the stratum of a new society over the South, the slaves will be transformed to free and equal citizens, and the chain, the lash, the shamble, and the bowie-knife will be preserved only as the fossil implements of an extinct race of half-human creatures.

We have, in the preceding pages, reviewed and condensed this great chapter of contemporaneous history from that point of view which regards it as the peaceful revolution

of a principle which, beginning with no strength but its own inherent rectitude, has gone on, step by step, against vast interests and over all imaginable obstacles to the noblest of successes. It was the noblest revolution of history, because in it only the legitimate weapons of truth were used. The strongholds yielded to the voices, the persuasions, the reasons, of just and earnest men; they were besieged with arrows of light, shelled with bombs of free thought and free schools. "Love is the hell-spark that burneth up the mountain of iniquity," said Mohammed. In the strength of a broad and irrepressible humanity, the anti-slavery revolution had gone on until the steps of Liberty were upon the threshold of a liberated and redeemed new world. The flag which had for many years represented the scars and stripes on the slave's back, had once again floated up, and promised to symbolize, as at first, the stars and streaks of humanity's dawn. The late war we have seen as a rebellion against this revolution. It was a league against the peaceful and legitimate evolution of Liberty on that continent—an insurrection against a resurrection.

Whilst we admire this fresh publication to our age of the law, that Justice, without wealth or weapons, is still irresistible, there is to be no less studied that reverse side of the lesson, which shows that evil, in the presence of its serene antagonist, for ever digs its own grave. We might, indeed, well have headed this record "The Suicide of American Slavery." We have seen, at each step, that every defiant movement of Slavery was a stab at its own heart. Its greed for extension created the opposition; its war against Mexico resulted in new free states; its mobs begot sympathy for its opponents among decent people; its slave-hunting in the North revealed its cruel nature to people before incredulous; its assassinations silenced Northern defenders; its hanging of John Brown gave its foes a watch-word and a battle-hymn; its treacherous disarming of the North led to its first victories, which made emancipation necessary; its animal ferocity evoked the energy which crushed it. It built about the nation a wall of fire, which cut off every way but that of universal and immediate emancipation. And when, at last, it had, in the merciful heart of the Republican President, one single remaining hope of lingering life, it planted its fang in that last spot of vitality, and must perish miserably and for ever. *Sic semper tyrannis.*

\* Since this article was written, the hope expressed in this sentence has been cruelly disappointed. The new President has, in his first effort at reconstruction, surrendered the United States Law—under which blacks and whites are equally citizens—by which alone he has any authority in a Southern state, to the behest of the slave-code which North Carolina had anterior to her secession. If the laws of that state are in force, by what right can the President appoint its Governor, or convoke its Conventions? Or is every law invalid except that, the working of which excludes from political rights the only class in the South that can be absolutely trusted? With such an example, of how the most loyal whites of the South are resolved to oppress the negroes to the utmost of their power, as the Legislature of Tennessee has just given, it may be regarded as certain that the Congress will set aside any pretended state which tries to enter without adopting the principle of negro-suffrage. To take from the crumbled slave-state the rottenest fragment to be corner stone of the new, were of course to surrender all the moral result of the war. The deplorable position which Mr. Johnson has taken is doubtless to be attributed, not to any love of slavery, but to the lack of legal training. A much stronger and more popular President put forth great efforts to carry through the last Congress the Louisiana organization, and failed, and it is a much more anti-slavery Congress with which Mr. Johnson has to deal in December next.

## THE SONG OF THE CAMPS.

Far away in the piney woods  
Where the dews fall heavy and damp,  
A soldier sat by the smouldering fire  
And sang the song of the camp.

"It is not to be weary and worn,  
It is not to feel hunger and thirst,  
It is not the forced march nor the terrible  
fight,  
That seems to the soldier the worst.

"But to sit through the comfortless hours,  
The lonely, dull hours that will come,  
With his head in his hands and his eyes on  
the fire,  
And his thoughts on visions of home.

"To wonder how fares it with those  
Who mingled so late with his life, —  
Is it well with my little children three,  
Is it well with my sickly wife?

"This night-air is chill to be sure,  
But logs lie in plenty around;  
How is it with *them* where wood is so dear,  
And the cash for it hard to be found?

"Oh that North air cuts bitterly keen,  
And the ground is hard as a stone,  
It would comfort me just to know that they  
sit  
By a fire as warm as my own.

"And have they enough to eat?  
My lads are growing boys,  
And my girl is a little tender thing,  
With her mother's smile and voice.

"My wife she should have her tea,  
Or maybe a sup of beer;  
It went to my heart to look on her face,  
So white — with a smile and a tear.

"Her form it is weak and thin,  
She would gladly work if she could,  
But how can a woman have daily strength  
Who wants for daily food?

"My oldest boy *he* can cut wood,  
And Johnny can carry it in,  
But then how frozen their feet must be  
If their shoes are worn and thin!

"I hope they don't cry with the cold —  
Are there tears in my little girl's eyes?  
O God! say *peace!* to these choking fears,  
These fears in my heart that rise.

"Many rich folks are round them, I know,  
And their hearts are not hard nor cold,  
They would give to my wife if they only  
knew,  
And my little one three years old.

"They would go, like God's angels fair,  
And enter the lowly door,  
And make the sorrowful glad with gifts  
From their abundant store.

"In this blessed Christmas time  
When the great Gift came to men,  
They would show, by their gentle and gener-  
ous deeds,  
How He cometh in hearts again.

"And my sickly, patient wife,  
And my little children three,  
Would be kindly warmed and fed and clothed  
As part of Christ's family.

"Well, I leave it all with God,  
For my sight is short and dim;  
He cares for the falling sparrow,  
My dear ones are safe with Him."

So the soldier watched through the night,  
Through the dew-fall, heavy and damp,  
And as he sat by the smouldering fire,  
He sang the song of the camp. J. R. M.

*St. Paul, Minn.*

*Church Journal.*

## LOVE.

BY ALICE CARY.

Tell you the way of love? Alas  
What of true love can words disclose?  
As well her shadow in the grass  
May paint the petals of the rose.

Its light is strange to you? Ah me!  
Your heart is an unquickened seed,  
And whatsoe'er your fortunes be  
I tell you are poor indeed.

What toucheth it, it maketh bright,  
Yet loseth nothing, like the sun,  
Within whose great and gracious light  
A thousand dew drops shine as one.

It aimeth for no lofty work,  
But taketh through the world its round,  
And maketh splendor of the dark,  
And of the silence, sweetest sound.

Haply that sometime you may see  
A maiden in a heavenly guise,  
With hands as white as charity,  
And her heart standing in her eyes:

If so, you will not bid me tell  
That which no language can disclose;  
For you will feel and know right well,  
The shadow cannot paint the rose.

— N. Y. Ledger.





